

REMARKS

The present invention relates to a built-in lamp having a holder for fastening the lamp in an installation surface. The built-in lamp also includes a bulb and a reflector with a reflector opening disposed in the direction of illumination and defining a generally parallel direct light discharge region from the bulb.

A generally coplanar diffuse light discharge region is formed around the planar direct light discharge region.

The bulb 6 and the direct light reflector 4 are arranged in the housing such that the housing has a planar inner surface 7 which overlies the reflector and which itself forms an additional reflector. This additional reflector 7 reflects at least a portion of the light from the bulb 6 to the diffuse light discharge region 2.

Additionally, the housing 10 is terminated in a largely dust-proof manner by a translucent scattering plate 13, 15 in the region of the diffuse light discharge region 2 and by a plate 13, 14. The direct light discharge region 1 has a circular shape while the diffuse light discharge region 2 is bounded on its inner side by the circular outer periphery of the direct light discharge region 1 and on its outer side by either a polygonal or a further circular line.

Claim 1 remains as the only independent claim in the instant application. Claim 1 has been carefully amended to more clearly define the additional reflector 7 which extends across the top of the main reflector 4. This additional reflector 7 forms a part of the housing and reflects a part of the light through the diffuse light region 2. Claim 1 has also been amended to clarify that the direct light discharge region 1 is generally coplanar with the diffuse light discharge region 2.

The Patent Examiner, however, has rejected previously submitted claim 1 as unpatentably obvious over Muggenburg (EP 1 033 530 A2) when combined with Jongewaard et

al. (US 6,561,670 A) and Martin (EP 0 648 971 A1). However, in view of Applicant's amendments to claim 1, the only independent claim, Applicant respectfully submits that this basis for rejection should be withdrawn.

More specifically, the Muggenburg reference admittedly discloses a light having a main discharge region 5 and diffuse light discharge regions 21a and 21b. The Muggenburg patent, however, differs from Applicant's invention as it is now defined in claim 1 in several important respects.

First, the Muggenburg patent discloses a fluorescent lamp 7 of the type oftentimes used in office buildings. As such, the diffuse regions 21a and 21b do not surround the main discharge region 5a as clearly defined in claim 1. Instead, these diffuse discharge regions 21a and 21b are merely provided opposite of the fluorescent lamp 7.

Additionally, claim 1 in the instant application now clearly requires that the direct discharge region and diffuse discharge region be coplanar. That certainly is not true with the Muggenburg patent. Instead, in Muggenburg the main discharge region 5 is clearly not coplanar with the diffuse discharge regions 21a and 21b. Indeed, the diffuse discharge regions 21a and 21b do not even lie in a parallel plane as the direct discharge region 5.

Lastly, claim 1 in the instant application now clearly defines the additional reflector 7 as a planar region of the housing which overlies the top of the main reflector. In Applicant's invention, the housing surface 7, which forms the additional reflector, reflects at least a portion of the light from the bulb 6 to the diffuse discharge region 2.

In sharp contrast to this, in the Muggenburg patent Muggenburg requires an additional element, namely the V-shaped reflector 15, be secured to the housing to deflect light from the bulb and to the diffuse regions 21a and 21b of the lamp assembly. The Patent Examiner will, of

course, appreciate that Applicant completely avoids the additional expense of this additional reflector 15 required by the Muggenburg patent.

The Jongewaard patent does not solve the deficiencies of the Muggenburg patent. More specifically, the Jongewaard patent admittedly discloses a lamp having a light emitting region 42. However, there is absolutely no suggestion in the Jongewaard patent of providing a reflective surface on the housing portion which overlies the main reflector in order to reflect light to the diffuse light discharge region as is now required by claim 1.

Lastly, the Patent Examiner's further reliance upon the Martin publication also fails to cure the deficiencies of the combination of Muggenburg and Jongewaard. The Martin publication discloses a lamp assembly having a bulb 5 which discharges light through a reflector 14 in a direct light discharge region. However, the Martin reference fails to disclose the planar housing surface which overlies the reflector and which forms a second reflector to reflect at least a portion of the light to the diffuse light discharge region surrounding the main direct light discharge region as is clearly required by claim 1 in this application. The Martin reference also fails to teach coplanar direct and diffuse light discharge regions as is also required by claim 1 in this application.

For all the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 patentably defines Applicant's invention over the prior art references of record and is, therefore, allowable. All remaining claims in this application depend from claim 1 and are, therefore, also allowable.

New drawings are submitted herewith as required by the Patent Examiner.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that this case is in condition for formal allowance and such action is respectfully solicited.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in the fees filed, asserted to be filed or which should have been filed herewith (or with any paper hereafter filed in this application by this firm) to our Deposit Account No. 07-1180.

Dated: December 2, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Douglas W. Sprinkle/

Douglas W. Sprinkle

Registration No.: 27,394

GIFFORD, KRASS, SPRINKLE, ANDERSON
& CITKOWSKI, P.C.

2701 Troy Center Drive, Suite 330

Post Office Box 7021

Troy, Michigan 48007-7021

(248) 647-6000

(248) 647-5210 (Fax)

Attorney for Applicant